

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Election Requirement dated March 9, 2004 Applicant elects with traverse Group I, Embodiment 1, and identifies Claims 1-4 drawn to a method of manufacturing a circuit device with a bonding step of pressing a terminal section against a wiring substrate, classified in class 29, subclass 846.

The Election Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct species. However, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Although the outstanding Official Action identifies different search classifications, it is believed that the claims of the present application would have to be searched in only a handful of overlapping sub-classes. Furthermore, since electronic searching is commonly performed, a search may be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional effort. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Election Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicant to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

Application No. 09/961,172
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2004

Accordingly, examination on the merits is believed to be in order and an early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\21s\214318US-PE.DOC